

Date: Sat, 20 Nov 93 04:30:08 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #470
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 20 Nov 93 Volume 93 : Issue 470

Today's Topics:

 Yet Another License S

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 17 Nov 93 11:47:33 edt
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!
cyber2.cyberstore.ca!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!utcsri!newsflash.concordia.ca!altitude!
mala.CAM.ORG!mala!Ranfry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Yet Another License S
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-=> Quoting Paulf @csli.stanford.edu to All <=-

P@> gganderson@augustana.edu (Kevin Anderson -7325) writes:

>I can agree with their being two classes, A and B, but my preference
>is not for the B=VHF and A=HF/VHF. I agree that A should be FULL
>license (what is called Advanced in several countries), but I would
>rather see it:

P@> [proposal deleted]

P@> This is in effect a six class license structure. Aside from the
P@> standard objections (too many classes), this isn't very translatable
P@> to the structures that other ITU nations are using. That's a fairly
P@> major consideration.

```
P@> --
P@> -=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots
P@> make ->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton
```

Hey, could always do it the way we do it in Canada. Two classes of tickets with three modifiers.

Basic class allows 250watts maximum power using commercial transmitters.

Advanced class allows full power using any transmitting equipments.

The Three modifiers are Code ability.

1) No proven ability, no HF use.

2) 5 WPM proven, 80m band

3) 12 WPM ALL bands.

Simple, no?

___ Blue Wave/QWK v2.12

Date: Wed, 17 Nov 1993 18:55:57 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.kei.com!world!dts@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov15.201435.28608@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<rcrw90-161193092126@node_13059.aieg.mot.com>, <2cdk9j\$jjvj@news.acns.nwu.edu>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

In article <2cdk9j\$jjvj@news.acns.nwu.edu> rdewan@casbah.acns.nwu.edu (Rajiv Dewan) writes:

>In article <rcrw90-161193092126@node_13059.aieg.mot.com>,

>Mike Waters <rcrw90@email.mot.com> wrote:

>>In article <1993Nov15.201435.28608@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,

>>paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) wrote:

>>

>>> rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

>>>

>>> >This assumes that manually sent and received CW is and will always remain

>>> >superior to any other mode. With certain exceptions this is no longer

```

>>> >true. SITOR/AMTOR for example have very nearly the same bandwidth, and
>>> >power requirements of CW, but with gauranteed zero errors!
>>>
>>> Woops, not quite. SITOR/AMTOR has an occupied bandwidth of about 500 Hz, or
>>> 5x that of a fast CW signal. In addition, the error control system is rather
>>> poor -- it's essentially a parity - retransmission scheme, with a fairly
>>> high overhead. Errors in AMTOR copy are pretty common.
>>
>>5x increase in bandwidth for 5X + increase in transmission speed is not a
>>bad tradeoff. Assuming that you can find CW operators who can sustain
>>error free copy at 20wpm and the AMTOR/SITOR is restricted to 300 baud.
>
>AMTOR is done a 100 baud.
>
>While AMTOR may have some advantages, it also has its own disadvantages:
>
> - it requires a transceiver with 20ms turnaround time or better

```

Nearly all modern rigs handle this fine. Even ones with T/R relays can meet this spec.

Also note that PACTOR, which is somewhat similar to AMTOR, uses longer transmissions, which cuts down the switching time requirements.

```

> - it will not work for many long path contacts or contacts more
>   a couple of hops away (timing problem)

```

I've never expereinced problems with this.

```

> - the killer as far I am concerned: there are not that many stations
>   available to talk to in AMTOR
>   Any one point there might be a few stations accessing APLINK BBS
>   but rarely do you find people looking for QSOS. I have done some
>   DXING on AMTOR (Aland Is, OH0 being the most notable) on AMTOR, but
>   this is far and few between.

```

Have you tried calling CQ? I get a response nearly every time I do. AMTOR is a mode used by a lot of ragchewers, so there are often a lot of ongoing conversations. RTTY is preferred for DX and contests, since there is no need to establish a link.

```

> - I have yet to encounter band conditions where I could maintain an
>   AMTOR link and yet fail to maintain a CW qso. I have encountered many
>   the other way. Many times: I try amtor, links fail and I switch to CW
>   and work stations from the same DX country or state.

```

I wonder if you run with narrow filters, etc. I normally have no problem getting good copy on a RTTY signal that is so far down in the noise that

I can hardly hear it. I have optimized my station for this ability, and the rewards have been many contacts under adverse conditions.

>
>Two weekends ago I spent a few hours on CW sweepstakes and then a few
>hours this last week end in WAE RTTY contest. One word for RTTY:
> sloooooow
>
>Like maple syrup in January. Sweet but slow.

RTTY runs at 60 cps (5 bit BAUDOT) as the standard mode. You can run at faster speeds if you want, and people will switch over and work you.

>
>On CW it is easy to sustain a rate of 50+ qsos per hour for quite a few
>hours. On rtty, at the hottest it was just around 15 for me.

When we are contesting, we have gotten up to 2 or 3 contacts per minute at times, but usually can go at 50 an hour if the conditions are with us and we are running them. Like any other contesting, it depends on your skills. I spent a lot of time operating RTTY and contesting RTTY, so I am good at that. I am less good at CW...

>
>>
>>I have never played with AMTOR so I really can't comment on the error rate,
>>clearly the mechanism exists to do error correction, if only by asking for
>>a repeat on a parity error as is done with packet. SITOR I have used and I
>>know that the output is error free, whatever goes on behind the scenes.
>>
>>Either way the error correction scheme is far better than anything
>>available for CW!
>>
>
>I have always heard that and I wonder if there is anything to it.
> a) if I were doing traffic this might be of some value, but most hams do
> not care (judging from the spelling and content) :) :)
> b) given good band conditions, both CW and AMTOR would be acceptable. AMTOR
> better because of its protocol.
> c) given marginal conditions, I would pick CW any day or night. Maintaining
> AMTOR links (needed for error free transfer) requires far better
> condition than CW does. And we are going to see a lot of that between
> now and 2000.

This is really not true, especially with the proper equipment. AMTOR can hold on when the S meter isn't moving at all. Could I copy CW under the same circumstances, perhaps, or perhaps not.

